

Sir Gawein's interpretation of Iwein's transgression and the 'Mabinogion' controversy

Article

Published Version

Thomas, N. (1987) Sir Gawein's interpretation of Iwein's transgression and the 'Mabinogion' controversy. Reading Medieval Studies, XIII. ISSN 0950-3129 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/85208/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Publisher: University of Reading

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Sir Gawein's interpretation of Iwein's transgression and the 'Mabinogion' controversy

Neil Thomas,
University of Durham

Various sources for Chrétien's *Yvain* were championed by combatants in the so-called Mabinogion controversy.¹ Before it became known that the date of the *Llyfr Coch Hergest* (Red Book of Hergest, which contains the eleven medieval Welsh tales known as Mabinogion) was later than that of Chrétien's romances, it was supposed by scholars such as Villemarqué and G. Stephens that the Welsh *Owain* was the origin of the French work.² This view had then to be abandoned, since a fourteenth-century Welsh text manifestly could not be the source of a twelfth-century French one. Yet the hypothesis of an ultimate Celtic inspiration for the Continental romance was by no means abandoned. By postulating the existence of earlier, ruder tales of *Owain*, *Peredur* and *Gereint* it was possible to argue that both the Mabinogion as we have them now and Chrétien's romances derive from French reworkings of Celtic originals.

'Le Chevalier au lion et le conte gallois dépendent l'un et l'autre d'une source commune, écrite en français, et du reste *inspirée elle-même par des traditions celtiques* (italics supplied).³

A.C.L. Brown, in an influential study, wrote that the romance of *Yvain* was basically a 'fairy mistress' story, and illustrated from a number of Irish and Welsh sources the nature of such fairy-mistresses as beings distinctly superior to their mortal lovers.⁴ R.S. Loomis pointed to what he took to be many further similarities between Continental romances and earlier Celtic myth.⁵

Against this view, C.B. Lewis attempted to prove Classical similarities for many motifs in *Yvain*,⁶ whilst Rudolf Zenker, taking his predecessors' views to be complementary rather than mutually

exclusive, postulated as source 'eine(r) Erzählung, in der jene antiken Elemente in das Gewand keltischer Feensage gekleidet worden waren.'⁷ The search for sources thus yielded rather inconclusive results. Yet despite that lack of unanimity, all the scholars mentioned above were united in the conviction that the imaginative source for *Yvain* was to be sought in pre-medieval literary traditions. In that belief they were united against the views of Chrétien's editor, Wendelin Foerster, who thought that Chrétien had worked in a largely free and spontaneous way on the composition of his romance. Unfortunately for Foerster, he strove to bolster his theories by some rather intemperate attacks on the 'Celtic' school of thought, with the result that many scholars of later generations have felt his championing of the 'Continental' theory to be transparently partisan:

'Foerster's motive seems to have been a desire to exalt the genius of Crestien, and this he thought could best be done by claiming for him a high degree of originality, not merely so as to exclude Celtic sources, but almost so as to exclude sources of any kind, and make Crestien sole creator of his matter, even to dismissing the poet's own statements to the contrary as medieval commonplaces not to be taken literally' (R.L. Thomson, p.25).

In this century the 'Celtic' hypothesis has gained ground over Foerster's 'Continental' theory. Such, at any rate, was the view of the translators of the 'Mabinogion', who wrote (in 1949) that there 'seems little room for doubt that the argument is now swinging to the 'Welsh' side, and that Chrétien's sources, little though we know of them, were derived from Welsh originals.'⁸ Many readers of *Yvain* today with no strong bias towards the Celtic hypothesis might still, I suspect, accept the idea that the work articulates an ancient, pre-courtly theme, and so concur with Philipot's compromise position:

Le cadre du *Chevalier au Lion* n'est pas autre chose que l'éternelle aventure, si souvent racontée par Marie de France, du mortel aimé d'une fée, et vivant auprès d'elle une vie de délices, puis, saisi par la même nostalgie qu'Ulysse chez Calypso, Tannhäuser chez Vénus, la quittant pour revivre la vie des hommes, rompant la foi jurée, arrivant enfin, après bien de traverses, à conquérir le pardon de sa dame immortelle.⁹

Consequently, the versions of Chrétien and of his German adapter Hartmann are now often regarded in effect as medieval retellings of a universal tale, the problematic dimension being held to consist in the hero's desertion of his lady. There are, however, grounds for doubting the validity of this interpretation and for enquiring whether the Continental romances do not perhaps tell a somewhat different story whose point and purpose is not that of the postulated archetype(s), and whose inspiration did not lie in any source earlier than the courtly period itself.

Let us grant that a story of the seduction of a mortal by a lady of supernatural origin might have become relocated in the twelfth century in the 'Arthurian' sphere. In that case, we must also conclude that the story would have attracted to it a new, problematical dimension. For the mortal would now have become a knight of the Round Table, bound to perform the obligations of his new rank. The early acceptance in older mythologies (including that of the postulated Celtic substratum thought by many to antedate parts of the extant Continental romances) of 'a close and continuous relationship between this earthly world and the Other World'¹⁰ would have been less acceptable to a medieval audience whose view of the world had been touched by Chivalry and Christianity. In the Continental romances denizens of supernatural realms are commonly treated as threats to the authority of the Arthurian Court, their challenges revealing 'aspects of a struggle between the world of chivalry and another, hostile world'.¹¹ The influence of Christianity tended to 'demonize' such figures:

'In the Middle Ages the folk held it possible that spirits or fairies could love or be loved by mortals. From the official Christian point of view such spirits were diabolical, incubi and succubae. Gradually this view reached the people, though legend and romance kept the older romantic view alive.'¹²

In this way, intercourse between mortals and spirits came to be seen as emblematic of a surrender of personal autonomy to older, 'pagan' forces which lay outside the jurisdiction of the chivalrous society.

It appears that the moralistic view of a knight's liaison with an exotic mistress has begun to predominate in the extant versions of the Yvain legend, for here Laudine is vested with scant moral authority.

She inhabits a realm which, with its wild animals and preternatural irregularities of nature (the thunderstorm, the mis-shapen 'giant herdsman'), is scarcely conformable to the proprieties of the Arthurian fellowship. Broceliande is no second Camelot, let alone a proto-Grail realm, as Leslie Topsfield argued (p. 176). It reflects a demonstrably more primitive stage of civilization than that represented by Camelot, and Laudine embodies a purely negative value: opposition to Arthurian chivalry. The madness which she causes Yvain is no just and measured penance but rather, as far as she knows, a *terminal* affliction (Yvain is cured later by Morgan the Fay's magic salve, not by Laudine herself).

Thus Laudine represents no value towards which her lover could profitably aspire, and she therefore cannot be made to conform to that courtly doctrine whereby the lady provides the moral stimulus for her lover's chivalrous deeds. It is not then surprising that the second half of *Yvain/Iwein* does considerable violence to the logic of the 'fairy mistress' tradition. If the romances were to follow that tradition then, as A.C.L. Brown pointed out, the second part of the story, beginning where Yvain is cured of his madness, ought to be a journey of wonders, in which the hero should overcome danger and vicissitude in order to regain the other world.¹³ But Chrétien's text gives 'no grounds for interpreting the second part of *Yvain* as the hero's attempt to earn his pardon',¹⁴ so that 'it is anything but clear how the adventures relate to Laudine'.¹⁵ The same can be said for the German version. Whereas the hero of *Gauriel von Muntabel* (c. 1280), a later German romance clearly influenced by Hartmann's *Iwein*, proposes to perform specific penances in order to win back his lady's favour,¹⁶ the chivalrous exploits which Iwein performs are not done at his mistress's behest, or even with her knowledge.

It therefore appears ill-founded to accept any interpretation of the romances which merely translates into twelfth-century idiom the terms of a postulated pre-courtly source, substituting the theme of a knight performing labours on behalf of his lady for that of a mortal appeasing a *fée*. Such an interpretation fails to acknowledge that the new *chivalric* ethic of the two works brings with it a fresh moral problem. According to the terms of that new ethic, any attempt by Yvain to win Laudine's pardon would run the risk of being construed as a neglect of the knight's proper (and only) obligation: to the Arthurian fellowship. Thus, if Yvain, in order to rehabilitate himself as a knight, must *resist Laudine's thrall*, then the didactic thrust of the

romance must be different from what it has often been taken to be. Since the German version, whilst following Chrétien closely in its plot, often spells out the moral of the story more explicitly than Chrétien, I shall give special consideration to Hartmann's version in the following analysis.

Dr Johnson's dictum concerning playwrights in eighteenth-century England applies all the more strongly to composers of narrative poems in the European Middle Ages: 'The Drama's Laws the Drama's Patrons give, For we that live to please, must please to live.' G.F. Jones has pointed out that, except for stray references to their own professional honour, 'the court poets stressed almost only the aristocratic honor code',¹⁷ adducing *Iwein*, 26-27 in partial support of his argument. Furthermore, since the courtly culture 'was above all integrated and intolerant of idiosyncracies', its members tended to 'develop a single personality type as their ideal and a one-dimensional scale of personal evaluation'.¹⁸ The standard of comparison by which other fictional knights are judged is provided by Gawein 'the standard bearer of the Arthurian order' (W.A. Nitze), who epitomizes the idealized traits favoured by the feudal aristocracy. It is against that preconceived standard, rather than in the *ad hoc* way which we associate with the modern *Entwicklungsroman*, that all knights before Parzival are set to 'develop'.

Iwein's name is linked very frequently with that of Gawein in both French and German versions (the non-editorial title of the Middle English version, which depends on Chrétien, is *Ywain and Gawain*). Both Chrétien and Hartmann underscore the two knights' friendship, Hartmann by claiming that their bond is more durable than that between two brothers (2702-08). The empathy between the two knights enables Gawein to predict misfortune from Iwein's liaison with Laudine, which he fears will annul the two friends' perfect community of chivalrous interests (see especially 2804-06, 2909-12).

From Gawein's point of view his friend's only obligation is to the Court whose values he has sworn to champion, rather than to the queen of an exotic wilderness remote from Arthurian regulation. For Gawein there are no moral ambiguities in the dilemma which his comrade-in-arms will presently face for he shows scant regard for the lovers' contract of marriage. Discounting the possibility that Laudine could have any moral claim on Iwein, he translates Iwein's future dilemma straightforwardly (to us, simplistically) into the temptation to *verligen* experienced by Erec, that is, a neglect of knightly

exertions in favour of a woman (2791-94). Gawein's prejudiced interpretation and subsequent long diatribe against time wasted in a married man's household chores undoubtedly contain for us much involuntary humour, yet he speaks in the authentic tones of the feudal aristocracy. In that society, utilitarian activities were left to menials or to 'the uneventful diligence of the women', for which reason 'any effort that does not involve an assertion of prowess comes to be unworthy of the men'.¹⁹

Whatever the merits or demerits of Gawein's interpretation, his equation of Iwein and Erec is likely to have predisposed a courtly audience to view Iwein's problem in the light of Erec's. The evidence furnished by the later *Diu Krone* (c. 1220) suggests that Gawein's analysis would have been favourably received by a contemporary audience. In that work the moral problem of Iwein's desertion of Laudine is simply obliterated by the bland assertion that Iwein had no case to answer:

Her Iwein wist die triuwe wol,
Ob man ez allez sagen sol,
Dô er durch it gaehen zorn
Haet nâhe sînen lip verlorn
In einem walde durch ir minne
Im selben zu ungewinne
Dô er verlôs die sinne.²⁰

On that analysis, the guilt and proneness to thoughts of suicide which constitute Iwein's 'madness' are judged to be but the consequential symptoms of his love for Laudine. Similarly, the unequivocating sympathy for Iwein voiced by Arthur (3239-48) and by the narrator (3249-60) in Hartmann's version prompt us to see his remorse as unnecessary since he emerges, on their analysis, as guiltless. This in turn suggests that pity for Iwein's malady (madness was looked upon with commendable compassion in the Middle Ages²¹) would have further encouraged a contemporary audience to take his side. Similarly, the author of the later *Gauriel von Muntabel* clearly thinks that the proper way to extricate his hero from his mistress's clutches is to enlist the support of Hartmann's fictional character, Erec, to advise Gauriel to return to the Arthurian court:

ein man sol ein vrumen lîp
niht lân verderben umbe ein wîp

noch durch ein liebez anesehen
 mir was vil nâhe alsô geschehen
 in den selben zîten
 dô ich vrowen Enîten
 von erst ze hûse sazte:
 it liebe mich entsazte
 von manlicher wirdikeit

(*Gauriel*, 2890-98)

Given that later authors such as Heinrich, Konrad and Der Pleier saw it as their job to present their works in the familiar narrative frames of their 'classical' predecessors,²² we can accept Konrad's testimony as further evidence for the presumption that Iwein's fault was seen in the thirteenth century to consist not in his desertion of Laudine (nor in the killing of Aşclan) but in his temporary dereliction of knightly duty (Gauriel's disloyalty to Arthur matches Iwein's failure to keep faith with Gawein). Yet that presumption can only be tested if we advert to the text itself, specifically to that sequence of exploits which Iwein performs after recovering his wits. For if the above presumption is correct then we ought to be able to discern in all his adventures a pattern of behaviour 'deren Stationen auf den Konflikt bezogen und Stufen seiner Bewältigung sind'.²³ What support does the text give to the supposition that Iwein's exertions are concerned with making amends to Gawein, rather than to Laudine?

It is a well-worn convention of the Arthurian romances that a knight should contrive to have his successes made known at Karidol. This is done typically by releasing a vanquished opponent on parole and commanding him to return to the Court to report there the name of the knight by whom he was defeated, or else by getting some other messenger to perform that same task. Iwein modifies that convention by having news of his successes relayed directly to Gawein. To be sure, sending the news to Gawein is natural since the episode involves Gawein's sister (as in Chrétien), yet Iwein's gesture means more than this, for he uses the opportunity to acknowledge Gawein as his mentor. Having freed a baron from the depredations of the giant Harpin, Iwein both instructs him to take news of his success to Gawein and at the same time encloses a lapidary tribute to his source of knightly inspiration:

mînen hern Gawein minn ich:
ich weiz wol, alsô tuot er mich:
ist unser minne âne kraft,
sône wart nie guot geselleschaft

(5107-10)

For Iwein says he has done everything for Gawein's sake:

und sult im des genâde sagen
swes ich in hie gedienet hân
wan daz hân ich durch in getân

(5120-22, italics supplied).

Gawein subsequently thanks the baron for his glad tidings and acknowledges the fact that Iwein did everything for his (Gawein's) sake (5686-89).

Iwein also frequently performs exploits which he deems to be intended for Gawein, and which therefore indicate an apprehension on his part that he is performing an imitation of his friend (both the victim of Harpin's oppressions and Lunete say that they would have had Gawein as their champion had he not been committed elsewhere). His refusal to accept the favours of a number of ladies as a reward for his services (see especially 3796-3805) is not glossed as evidence of his fidelity to Laudine but rather as an indication of the dispassionate service to ladies which he is newly able to demonstrate. When the younger sister of the Count of the Black Thorn asks a favour of him he is careful to point out that he now puts his services at the disposal of all:

er sprach 'ichn habe gnâden niht:
swem mîns dienstes nôt geschiht
und swer guoter des gert
dern wirt es niemer entwert

(6001-04)

At this point he is able to match Gawein's legendary reputation for being the champion of all ladies rather than the lover of one,²⁴ thereby demonstrating that no second Laudine will be able to ensnare him.

That an emulation of Gawein and thus a rehabilitation as an Arthurian knight is the ulterior purpose of Iwein's various exploits

(and not a reconciliation with Laudine) is shown strikingly when he refuses to drop his incognito and reveal his identity to Laudine on the one occasion when he is afforded the opportunity to do so, when he champions Laudine's companion, Lunete. For now Iwein shows himself to be motivated by the larger purpose of proving himself Gawein's peer in their judicial combat over the Black Thorn inheritance. In this context the legal issue (as to which sister is in the right) is of considerably less moment than the theme of the proving of Iwein (the legal adjudication is performed later by Arthur, and not by either of the combatants). The climactic positioning of this drawn combat (it occurs considerably earlier in the Welsh *Owain*) demonstrates effectively that Iwein here raises himself to the standard set by his friend and mentor.

Gawein is thus shown consistently to be the moral foundation upon which Iwein builds his knightly rehabilitation. His various exertions prove that he has taken to heart the rather minatory description of Erec which Gawein clearly meant to be applicable to Iwein too:

wan daz er sichs erholte
sît als ein rîter solte
sô waere vervarn sîn êre
der minnete ze sêre

(2795-98)

Iwein's actions can best be imagined as an active response to Gawein's implicit exhortation to him not to become like Erec and thus as an acceptance and gradual 'internalisation' of his comrade's somewhat unsentimental attitudes to love and marriage. In the absence of any direction by Laudine, the example of Gawein supplies the only programme by which Iwein can achieve his rehabilitation. Iwein's love for Laudine, so far from forming the nucleus of the romance, is simply one episode woven into an extensive narrative whose major purpose is to show how Iwein, by emulating Gawein, becomes inducted into the ways of the Arthurian fellowship whose *esprit de corps* is shown to depend on the principled stultification of many emotional needs and obligations.

Such being the purpose of Iwein's exploits, we can now reject the two previous attempts to explain what Iwein is about in this section of the narrative, as they are conflated by J.W. Thomas:

'Iwein does penance for having abandoned his wife by protecting a succession of other women and also for his act of violence by preventing others from perpetrating similar crimes'.²⁵

On the first count, we have observed how Laudine is denied any influence over Iwein's career as a knight and so becomes a merely negative figure with no say over how Iwein conducts himself. No doubt she could have been made to tell a story of her own, like the wronged Orgeluse in Wolfram's *Parzival*, but neither Chrétien nor Hartmann develops the story from her point of view. Iwein's intemperate slaying of Ascalon is, likewise, an event whose moral dimensions are hinted at ('âne zuht', 1056) rather than explored in depth, possibly for the reason that, in medieval aristocratic society, 'aggression becomes the accredited form of action, and booty serves as *prima facie* evidence of successful aggression' (Veblen, pp. 12 ff.). Iwein's (to us) inordinate desire to procure proof of his defeat of Ascalon for Kei is, historically, a blameless action since he merely seeks to make himself answerable to the society which gives him his *raison d'être*.

What of the final crux of the work, the puzzling epilogue, where Iwein is made to rejoin Laudine? At first sight, this looks like a late obtrusion of an old 'fairy mistress' pattern, for as A.C.L. Brown pointed out, 'fairy mistress stories in Celtic and elsewhere are apt to end with the happy return of the hero to live with his supernatural wife' (Brown (1905), p. 674). Yet that reading is simplistic and misleading in this context, for the ending is so egregiously unmotivated (it depends on Lunete's ruse to reconcile the couple rather than on Iwein's satisfactorily achieved exploits) as to render it wholly inconsistent with the logic of that old story pattern. We cannot view it ending happily when there is no satisfying continuity between the ending and the antecedent narrative.

It is even less satisfying to read the conclusion as Iwein's symbolic induction into the 'higher' realm of Laudine, for that is a view which is false on two counts. First, it ignores the fact that Iwein strives for no higher approbation than that of his foremost peer (he rejoins Laudine only on a late impulse). Secondly, it makes the unsubstantiated assumption that Laudine is suddenly vested with a moral superiority over the Arthurian fellowship which permits her to reclaim for herself a knight whose stature is now equal to that of Gawain. Hildegard Emmel states that Laudine's realm represents an

alternative form of authority which foreshadows that of the Grail ('der formale ansatz für den Gralroman'). Yet she has to concede that Chrétien gave no symbolic value (Gehalt) to this new realm:

'Erst Wolfram hat durch die menschliche und religiöse Ausweitung der Handlung den Gehalt für den zweiten Lebenskreis gefunden'²⁶

Her argument (and later, similar ones) must be rejected as resting so obviously on the false analogy of Arthurian and Grail realms in the Grail romances.

It is more logical to suppose that Broceliande represents a merely erotic paradise and that Chrétien (whom we know to have written a lost Tristan romance) chooses to leave us with an impression of the equiponderance of the forces of love and knightly honour. The analogy of the *Minnegrotte*, the lovers' refuge from their social obligations in the Tristan legend, would better fit Yvain's final recidivism than would that of the Grail realm. Moreover, Chrétien's qualification of his previous didactic thrust would have commended itself to Hartmann, who articulates the view more strongly than Chrétien that Iwein's sexual passion has the potential to blind him to any other obligation (see especially 1439-45).

Hartmann's earlier work, *Erec*, is notable for being, on the one hand, the *locus classicus* for the idea that love and honour can be reconciled and, on the other, a work in which that positive conclusion is subtly undermined by some rather tart authorial observations. The most notable example of this occurs when the narrator intervenes to resist the obfuscating talk of love as an inspiration to chivalrous deeds, instead unmasking the cult of *minne* as a euphemistic fiction, since 'love' really inspires knights only to sexual excesses.²⁷ It is likely that the sceptical asides of *Erec* and the corrective epilogue of *Iwein* perform the same function of questioning the courtly doctrine of love. The conclusion of *Iwein* is possibly an imaginative attempt to repeat the query which overhangs the ostensibly 'happy ending' of the earlier work. In as much as that repeated query points to an abiding concern with Hartmann, it is necessary to challenge the theory that *Iwein* is a merely parodic treatment of the Arthurian ideal, in which the lineaments of a far better world are adumbrated at the eleventh hour. Hartmann's 'Artus-Kritik' is that of the honest doubter, not that of the cynic. He presents his audience with a moral challenge rather than with a mocking elegy upon the chivalrous ethos.

The foregoing discussion of the development of the Yvain legend in France and Germany shows that the legend, whatever incidental similarities it bears to other literature, was organised by Chrétien and Hartmann into a form which was made to yield a bracing contemporary *Problematik*. The discrepancy in thought-structure between these two versions and any of the postulated archetypes is so wide that we must dismiss them as possible sources. In particular, *Yvain/Iwein* is no Celtic fairy mistress story with an overlay of *courtoisie*, but rather a work whose whole moral substance derives from questionings of the courtly period itself.

Notes

- ¹ References are to Kristian von Troyes, *Yvain (Der Löwenritter)* edited by Wendelin Foerster with *Nachtrag* by Alfons Hilka, Halle a.S. 1926; Hartmann von Aue, *Iwein*, edited by G.F. Benecke, K. Lachmann, L. Wolf with parallel modern German translation by Thomas Cramer, Berlin and New York 1981.
- ² *Owein*, or *Chwedyl Iarlles y Ffynnawn*, edited by R.L. Thomson, Dublin 1968, introduction, p. 25.
- ³ This was the view of Jean Frappier, quoted by Thomson, p. 57.
- ⁴ A.C.L. Brown: 'Iwain, A Study in the origins of Arthurian romance' (= (Harvard) *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 8), Boston 1903.
- ⁵ R.S. Loomis, *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*, New York 1949.
- ⁶ C.B. Lewis, *Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance*, Oxford 1932.
- ⁷ R. Zenker, *Forschungen zur Artusepik I, Ivainstudien*, Halle 1921, p. 169.
- ⁸ *The Mabinogion*, translated by Gwyn and Thomas Jones, London 1949, introduction, p. 29.
- ⁹ E. Philipot, 'Un épisode d'Érec et Énide: La Joie de la Cour - Mabon l'enchanteur', *Romania* 25, 1896, 258-294, (264).
- ¹⁰ Leslie Topsfield, *Chrétien de Troyes; A Study of the Arthurian romances*, Cambridge 1981, p. 15.
- ¹¹ Lewis Jillings, 'The abduction of Arthur's queen in *Diu Crône*', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 19, 1975, 16.
- ¹² J.A. MacCulloch, *Medieval Faith and Fable*, London 1932, p. 45.
- ¹³ A.C.L. Brown, 'The knight of the lion', *PMLA* 20, 1905, 674.

- ¹⁴ Z.P. Zaddy, *Chrétien studies. Problems of form and meaning in 'Erec', 'Yvain' and the 'Charrete'*, Glasgow 1973, p. 79.
- ¹⁵ Tony Hunt, 'Chrétien de Troyes' Arthurian romance, *Yvain*, in Boris Ford (editor), *The New Pelican Guide to English literature*, volume one, part two, Harmondsworth 1983, p. 139.
- ¹⁶ *Gauriel von Muntabel*, edited by Ferdinand Khull, Osnabrück 1969, 279-86.
- ¹⁷ G.F. Jones, *Honor in German Literature*, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 1959, p. 60.
- ¹⁸ M. Joos and F. Whitesell, *A Middle High German Courtly Reader*, Madison, Wisconsin 1958, p. 243.
- ¹⁹ Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, Boston 1899, p. 14.
- ²⁰ *Diu Crône* by Heinrich von den Türlin, edited by G.H.F. Scholl, Stuttgart 1852, 1354-60.
- ²¹ Edith Wright, 'Medieval attitudes towards mental illness', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 7, 1939, 352-56.
- ²² See Peter Kern, *Die Artusromane des Pleier*, Stuttgart 1981.
- ²³ Peter Wapnewski, *Hartmann von Aue*, seventh edition Stuttgart 1979, p. 52.
- ²⁴ Jessie L. Weston, *The Legend of Sir Gawain*, London 1897, p. 45.
- ²⁵ J.W. Thomas (translator), *Iwein, the Knight of Fortune's Wheel*, Lincoln, Nebraska 1979, introduction, 12.
- ²⁶ Formprobleme des Artusromans und der Graldichtung, Bern, Frankfurt 1951, p. 39.
- ²⁷ See *Erec*, edited by Thomas Cramer, Frankfurt 1972, 3691-3705.